

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

DAVID M. GRECO,

Plaintiff,

v.

GURBIR S. GREWAL, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:19-cv-19145 (BRM) (TJB)

**ORDER**

**THIS MATTER** is opened to the Court on Plaintiff David M. Greco’s (“Plaintiff”) Motion for a Preliminary Injunction Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65. (ECF No. 1.) Defendants New Jersey Attorney General Gubir S. Grewal, Jared M. Maples, and the New Jersey Office of Homeland Security and Preparedness (collectively, the “State Defendants”), and the Camden County Prosecutor’s Office, Jill S. Mayer, and Nevan Soumails (collectively, the “County Defendants”) opposed the Motion. (ECF No. 32.) Defendants Gloucester Township Police Department, Bernard John Dougherty, Nicholas C. Aumendo, Donald B. Gansky, William Daniel Rapp, and Brian Anthony Turchi (collectively, the “Township Defendants” and with State and County Defendants, “Defendants”) filed correspondence joining and adopting the legal arguments advanced by the State and County Defendants but declining to provide any briefing of their own. (ECF No. 33.)

The Court held oral argument on November 20, 2019. (ECF No. 39.) On December 5, 2019, Plaintiff submitted a supplemental letter brief. (ECF No. 44.) On January 10, 2020, Plaintiff filed a Motion for Class Certification (“Class Certification Motion”) pursuant to Rule 23(b). (ECF No. 48.) State and County Defendants submitted joint correspondence opposing the Class Certification Motion (ECF No. 49), and Plaintiff replied (ECF No. 50). On January 17, 2020, the

Court entered an Order granting the State and County Defendants' request, administratively terminating Plaintiff's Class Certification Motion without prejudice, and requesting further briefing from the parties on the issue of standing. (ECF No. 51.) On January 24, 2020, Plaintiff submitted his initial brief (ECF No. 52) to which the State and County Defendants responded (ECF No. 53.) On January 31, 2020, the Township Defendants submitted correspondence joining and adopting the legal arguments advanced by the State and County Defendants but declining to provide any briefing of their own. (ECF No. 54.) On February 3, 2020, Plaintiff filed his reply brief. (ECF No. 55.)

Having reviewed the submissions filed in connection with the Motion and having considered the arguments raised at the preliminary hearing, for the reasons set forth in the accompanying opinion and for good cause appearing,

**IT IS** on this 21st day of February 2020,

**ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion for a Preliminary Injunction (ECF No. 1) is **DENIED**; and it is further

**ORDERED** that, pursuant to the Court's November 25, 2019 Order (ECF No. 42), Defendants shall answer, move, or otherwise respond to the Complaint no later than **March 12, 2020.**

*s/ Brian R. Martinotti*  

---

HON. BRIAN R. MARTINOTTI  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE